

HONOLULU ADVERTISER  
1 December 1981

# Turner: our nukes in Europe worth little militarily

By Walter Wright

Advertiser Staff Writer

LIHUE — U.S. nuclear missiles in Europe are a political bargaining chip but would have no real military value, a former director of the Central Intelligence Agency said here yesterday.

Retired Admiral Stansfield Turner, who ran the CIA under President Carter, contradicted President Reagan's Nov. 16 statement that there is no equivalent deterrent to Soviet intermediate missiles aimed at Europe.

Turner made his comments in an interview here as U.S. representatives began negotiations with the Soviet Union in Geneva on nuclear arms in Europe.



Turner

"We've got thousands of counters" to the Soviet missiles, Turner said. "They're in Nebraska, they're on submarines, they're in bombers, they're on tactical airplanes in Europe."

Turner's statements appeared to undercut the U.S. bargaining position. But Turner said Washington should continue to use the threat of European nuclear missiles in the bargaining process.

And he said it would be a severe psychological blow to NATO if deployment were stopped without winning concessions from the Soviets.

But militarily, he said, Europe needs stronger conventional defenses.

Turner said it is ironic that some Europeans now oppose the missiles, because it was the Europeans who asked Washington in 1979 to deploy the missiles in 1983 as a counter to new Soviet missiles aimed at them. Europeans felt the U.S. missiles would ensure a U.S. nuclear response and thus better deter a Soviet attack on them, Turner said.

Turner disagrees with that "linkage" theory, "nor do I think it's very credible that it is easier for us to fire missiles on Moscow from West Germany than it is from Nebraska."

Reagan on Nov. 16 proposed the "zero option" — Washington would deploy no nuclear missiles in Western Europe if the Soviets agreed to dismantle existing SS-20 and other intermediate range missiles. Turner said the proposal is "top-sided" but still attractive to the Soviets because it would trade missiles capable of hitting Russia for missiles which can't reach America.

Turner said a "major hazard" in the negotiations is that the Soviets may seek far-reaching limits on Cruise missile systems outside European boundaries. Cruise missiles, less vulnerable than the bomber and the ICBM, are the key U.S. strategic weapon of the future, Turner feels.

Even if Washington agrees to keep Cruise missiles off European soil, it could still place them in submarines a few miles off shore. "The Soviets will see that. That will be one of the reasons it will be difficult to get an agreement."

Turner said negotiations won't get anywhere until major strategic weapons systems also are discussed, in the spring.

Even then, he said, "the most we can hope for in the near term is to continue SALT I, SALT II-type controls on the very big systems, the very threatening first-strike systems, and maybe even get some reductions in those."

"People are unduly hopeful that we will get nuclear disarmament, a reduction in budgets for nuclear arms, or that we'll stop the race in nuclear weapons, that we'll stop inventiveness," he said.

"All three are beyond hope for many years to come, too difficult to achieve, to verify, and too dangerous. If we did do away with all nuclear weapons, what happens if Khadafy builds 10?"